


INITIAL REPRESENTATIONS SUPPORTING THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT OF PLÉMONT HOLIDAY VILLAGE

REFERENCE	NAME/PARISH	REPRESENTATION
1PIS	Paul Acton-Phillips, St Helier	Regarding the Plemont Public Inquiry I would like to submit that the current proposal ticks all the right boxes as follows: The area will be tidied up. As I understand it public areas will be increased. The development is well away from the coastline. The houses to be built will be an asset to the area and provide badly needed housing. The amount of extra traffic would not be apparent, considering the movements of cars to Plemont beach and cafe. It is past the time when a decision should be made in favour of these changes, too many past Planning Ministers have sat on their hands over the matter. See it through, and in five years' time everybody will say - what was all the fuss about? Thank you for taking notice of my views.
2PIS	Rita & Tony Allman, St Saviour	My wife and I are of the opinion that the revised plans by Mr T Hemmings are such that his application should receive your approval. The removal of the existing eyesore and the gift of two thirds of the site to the public of the Island of Jersey by Mr Hemmings is to be applauded. It is our hope that this matter can be brought to a speedy conclusion.
3PIS	A R Beer, St Helier	My own personal view is that the last planning application of Thirty Traditional House's of Granite Construction should be allowed to go ahead with the remaining site turned back to natural habitat. The National Trust do a marvellous job in this Island with the renovating of the period house's, Farms and Natural area's for all people to enjoy and for the wild life. But I do think this last application is perfect for this area and will still leave large area's of natural ground with public access for all to enjoy compared to some other development in other area's of the island.
4PIS	Gerry & Julie Bougourd St Ouen	I think there have been very few occasions when we have made any comment on planning issues; however we both feel very strongly about the way this particular saga has gone on and on over many years, during which time the old holiday camp has gradually deteriorated into the eyesore it is today. We are totally against public money being used to purchase the property from the developer and we were disappointed to learn that Senator Bailhache is intending to take this proposal back to the States once again. The latest plans for the site indicate a reasonable scale of development and will much improve the area and any reference to problems with traffic etc. are ludicrous when one considers the amount of

		traffic that passed through this area when the holiday camp was operational. It is also clear from the site plan that much of the old building area will be returned to nature and quite frankly the time has come for common sense to prevail, permit the development and get rid of this blot on the landscape.
5PIS	Steven & Sue Foulds, St Peter	We would like to register our thoughts on this long standing debate and confirm that we fully support the current application. It provides a private investment improvement on land that will cost a fortune to 'return to nature' that we as tax payers cannot afford. By allowing this application to go ahead it is surely a win win situation as someone else funds a large proportion of this extensive project and produces something that is a 100% improvement on what is there. We should have learnt from our costly mistakes by now and let private investment help us through this recession. This project can only benefit our economy. The tax payer money that would be 'wasted' here can be put to good use refurbishing the existing hospital (not moving it) and extending it into the surrounding properties already owned by the States.
6PIS	John Henwood MBE, St John	SEE ANNEX 1
7PIS	Philip Jeune, St Martin	My view is that the developer should be allowed to put homes on the site, no larger in total than the footprint of the holiday camp that was there before, in exchange for giving the people of Jersey sufficient part of the seaward side of the land to create a good footpath, viewing points and picnic areas. I do not believe that the public of Jersey should be asked to fund the purchase of the land.
8PIS	Chris Lamy, St Ouen's Bay	I believe that consent should be given for the demolition of the buildings on the Plemont site and the construction of 30 homes. Also the States should accept the offer of coast land from the developers. It is high time that common sense prevailed and this matter was put to bed.
9PIS	T Langlois, St Clement	This land should not be purchased with tax payers money. If the money can be found by other means then a consideration could be applied. This land is ideal for building on for many reasons. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. St Ouen is a very large Parish with little development, so building on the site again is good for Jersey, the people who buy these houses will release other property thus give lower down people the chance to purchase. 2. Plemont is off the beaten track so if saved who would it benefit? You never drive past it, you have to go out of your way to visit it. How many States members have visited this site in the past year - six... Apart from the Cafe, that would not be affected, there is nothing there to do. 3. This could be an ideal time to consider building a second town development for

		<p>Jersey - new jobs, infrastructure and take pressure away from other Parishes.</p> <p>4. Now and nor any other time would be suitable for tax payer money to purchase this site. We have 2000 out of work, infrastructures falling to pieces - you just have to look at the roads and here we are considering buying some land to grass over for what?</p> <p>The National Trust have enough land that no one ever visits, this land would just be added. It would be nice if someone was to signal their intention to buy some land in my Parish to keep green.</p>
10PIS	A Luce, St John	<p>I think that the development should be allowed as public money should not be used for that. The sum of £800000 is what is said it would cost to buy. What about the cost of demolishing digging out the foundations then bringing in top soil and as far as my family [60 of us] we don't want our money wasted on that site. As to traffic when the holiday camp was there coaches, hire cars and locals were up and down all the time not forgetting deliveries. If all the heritage want, let them buy it, but not with our money and don't forget the States of Jersey have no money . As it is they waste too much if they ran their bossiness like they run they would be bankrupt.</p>
11PIS	M Machon, St Ouen	<p>Having lived in St Ouen for over twenty years, I have only once walked on the cliff path by the holiday camp buildings, which in the present state as everyone will agree, are in an awful state. Why not let the proposed building be granted? Although Mr Hemmings as I am led to believe is a wealthy man, surely he will want a return on the £5 million which has been dormant now for quite a few years. How much will it cost the States to purchase and more importantly to clear and make good the land? The States are over spending on many things recently, why don't they put the money into a new hospital or other schemes. Be sensible for a change and the new development proceed.</p>
12PIS	Judy Martin Deputy St Helier No.1	<p>I have no problem with the new plans and the new roads planned up there, but If there is overwhelming move from the public to buy the land I CANNOT SUPPORT THE IT COMING FROM PUBLIC PURSE. The people who will want to return it to nature must come up with the money as there will be far more who cannot be bother until they think their taxes will be spent on it. I have now seen I think 3 or 4 sets of plans for Plemmont and I think the developers have moved as far as they can and have my full support but would still like to be kept informed.</p>
13PIS	P E Mauger, St Peter	<p>In my opinion the Plemont site should proceed with the farm house style development. This site has lain empty for years and now is the time for something to be done. Jersey cannot afford to simply buy the site at a loss and turn it into wild country side, money is scarce, and if there is a developer who wants to carry out the scheme at no cost to</p>

		ourselves, let them proceed. This matter has dragged on far too long and a decision must be made promptly, or we'll all be in our coffins if its allowed to drag on any longer!
14PIS	Leslie Norman, Grouville	I am writing to confirm my views in relation to the proposed Plemont Development. It would be a total waste of public money to acquire this whole site and return it back to nature. I truly believe that a sympathetic development of granite houses as proposed would be more than satisfactory with more open space being left available for the public. This is not an area which is likely to be visited by large numbers of locals or visitors because of its location other than the cliff path which would be more than adequately protected. We must rein in the excesses of the preservationist lobby which are really getting out of hand.
15PIS	Plemont Estates Ltd	Please click the paperclip to view representation 
16PIS	Gary Romeril, Bonne Nuit Bay	I feel that for the States to purchase this land on behalf of the public is a big mistake due to the following; Even if we had loads of money it would still be a wrong decision and I would not support purchase. With the current plans as an Island we would be getting two things - The headland given back to nature at no public purse cost and much needed family housing. To purchase the land would be extremely costly as basically we would be buying a third of the land only as that is what is planned for development. The rest is already to be given back to the public at no cost. I am a firm believer and strong advocate of protecting our Island from unsuitable development but in this case as long as it is a proven that this meets the requirements of planning and I believe it does that then we should support it as an Island and not support purchase. We could as an Island say we want the States to buy all derelict buildings and return them to nature but who would or could pay? The Cheval Roc Hotel in Bonne Nuit has just been refused development after a long hard fought battle against the development by our group the friends of bonne nuit but at no time would we have even considered asking the States to purchase it and return it to nature. All we want to do is ensure what is developed is right for the site and area exactly the same view is held by me for the Plemont site. Please do not waste our public money when we have a golden goose here going to give back most of the site and develop part of it which we be landscaped and kept in good order at no cost to us the taxpayer.
17PIS	Paul Sands, St Ouen	I am strongly against the proposition that the States should purchase the Plemont site and return it to nature, and strongly in favour of the latest plans for re-development. It has been a developed site for many years and its renewal is a matter for the owners within current planning laws. The proposition that the States should purchase the land for £8m+ and spend a similar amount to clear the site would be a reckless waste of money. The Island, like most countries, is in a critical financial period where the prospects for some years

		<p>ahead are bleak. The current plans retain the cliff path with its wonderful views to the sea, improve dramatically the views from the path inland, return 2/3rds of the current site to the public, provide good quality much needed housing, provide new money and jobs into the economy. This is a great deal for Jersey. The marginal benefit for a huge public expenditure to stop the development of 1/3rd of the site would be a criminal waste of public money to satisfy a tiny portion of Islanders. The supporters of the proposition to purchase, or in some way deny the owner of his right to re-develop, get significant publicity but are not representative of the majority of the Island. The National Trust for Jersey has a very narrow and indulgent brief. They have no responsibility for the future socio-economic wellbeing of the Island and its people. Much is made of the 7,000 people attending the Line in the Sand. 85,000 people did not attend. The 7,000 could donate an average of £2,000 each to buy and clear the site if they wished. In a photograph of a section of the Line in the Sand event published in the JEP last week, 13 were children and dogs, 14 were adults. I suspect that it represents the views of a much smaller group of families than presented. As is customary most of the letters to the JEP are from opposers to development, but these too only amount to a dozen or two people, a tiny portion of Islanders. All of the opposers to development also want the States to provide better education, health, social services, security, infrastructure, jobs and houses for children leaving school or returning from university etc. To ask for the States to spend money on Plemont too is selfish in the extreme. The current site has been a disgrace for years as a result of constant interference from the public and planning. Jersey still has fantastic areas of undeveloped coastal and inland environments. Any reversion of Plemont to nature would attract or benefit very few people. We also have a huge responsibility to provide living environments, including jobs, houses and States systems, for an increasing population just like all countries. The increasing population includes Islanders living longer and Jersey born children as well as those who become Islanders through working here. In the current economic situation the States must spend its money very wisely. We are lucky that some people are still keen to renew much of what we have on the Island, whether it be their own homes or businesses, and such renewal should be encouraged and supported. The Plemont development will be a huge improvement on what is there; El Tico is a great improvement on what was there before; Portelet is/will be seen as a huge improvement on what was there before; plans to renew the Watersplash should be supported etc. If the States interfere further with this, and if they waste any public money on it, I think the reaction of top-rate taxpayers and willing private investors in the Island could be very damaging.</p>
--	--	--

18PIS	Ben Shelton, Grouville	SEE ANNEX 2
19PIS	Paul Strudwick, St Brelade	<p>I would like to add my support for the proposed development for the Plemont area. I have had a look at the plans and thought they were in keeping with the area, they did not overcrowd the site and the houses are far enough away from the headland to be inconspicuous from the sea and the footpath. The materials being proposed will also help the buildings to merge into the landscape. I believe they would add to the area which could become barren and rather inhospitable and are certainly a long overdue improvement on the current buildings. In an island as small as ours with a population the size it has become, it is not unreasonable for such areas to be developed in a sympathetic way. In my opinion this development seeks to harmonise the living areas with the available space by clustering small groups of buildings with larger areas of open space.</p>
20PIS	Dick Turpin, St Helier	<p>I would first of all like to state that I am disappointed that there was ever a need for the Plemont Enquiry, and also that Senator Sir Philip Bailhache has thrown his hat into the mix. In my view, and it is one of a Jersey born pensioner, I believe the Enquiry team must put aside all the spin and emotional aspects so far well covered in the local press, and about to be displayed to Prince Charles, and make their judgement on the reality of the whole matter. Let us look at the facts in no particular order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed development in not sited on the headland and would be well back from the current buidlings. 2. Two-thirds of the site would be ceded to the States. 3. Stating that the headland is one of Jersey's most beautiful natural areas is exaggerated. 4. Senator Sir Philip Bailhache would have us believe that the financial implication is not as frightening as people might think. Does this mean that he has inside knowledge of the cost of buying the site, demolition costs, and restoration costs? Even at a possible 14 million + estimate this would be half the total recently proposed to fund refurbishment and new building costs by Housing. 5. 'For future generations' are words often quoted by Jersey Heritage, the National Trust and other minority groups in support of their beliefs. I sincerely believe that future generations will be best served by adequate school classrooms, adequate housing, a health and care system for purpose, and plans that guarantee employment when they leave school/college. The proposed development will safeguard the headland, provide continuity of cliff-path walks, restore 2 thirds of the land to public access and cost Island tax-payers nothing. Doesn't this make economical sense, or am I missing something? I can only hope that the Enquiry Board come to a sensible conclusion, which is not hindered by any form of points scoring.

21PIS	D Waters, St Peter	<p>The tax payer should not pick up any cost in this regard. This could happen in one of two ways. The taxpayer may be asked to acquire the site or they will face a legal claim for damages from the owner of the land who bought the land with certain rights attached. The offer he has made in terms of modifying the development are very generous and should be accepted. The argument that residents of Jersey need the open space is fallacious. There are plenty of cliff paths and so on which are underutilised. I have nothing to do with the owner or the developer but I am a concerned taxpayer.</p>
22PIS	David & Carol-Ann Syvret St Helier	<p>I am forwarding an e-mail, I sent to our Parish Representatives in June regarding Plemont Headland and would like to register our opinion with regard to this application. We feel the current application is a great improvement on the existing eyesore and the fact that 67 per cent of the site is to be returned to natural beauty is a real benefit for the Island. The Island can ill afford spending millions of pounds on a site which will probably not be cared for, as witnessed with the Bal Tabarin site, when a new sewage plant, hospital, etc,etc seems a better use of the Island's resources.</p> <p>Dear Deputies Rondel, Hilton and Higgins and Constable Crowcroft I am writing on behalf of myself and my husband to advise that we are NOT in favour of the States of Jersey spending taxpayers money on the purchase of the Plemont Headland as proposed by Senator Bailhache. If the National Trust of Jersey want to purchase the land they should do so through their own means rather than calling upon taxpayers who are being hit from all angles with less tax allowances, 20 means 20 and increased GST. We have both known buildings to be on this site for the whole of our lives and whilst accepting that these are currently an eyesore, partly due to numerous years of States deliberation on the development of this site, we believe that the current proposals, which include returning part of the site back to its natural "beauty" as an acceptable solution. Our reasons for being against this are, the economic climate at this time, together with the need for (what we consider to be far more important/needed projects) such as a new Police Station, new Hospital/upgrading of health facilities, provision of homes, lack of employment. We believe these are much more worthwhile and in need of States spending! We hope as our public representatives you will take our feelings into account when this proposition is being debated in the House.</p>

ANNEX 1

The application to demolish the former holiday village buildings and construct 28 dwellings should be **approved** for the following reasons:

- The former holiday village has become an eyesore and it will continue to deteriorate
- The development plans will erase the former holiday village, all areas of hard standing and leave much of the area to be reclaimed by nature
- It is a brown field site and has been providing visitor accommodation throughout living memory
- The planned new dwellings will occupy a footprint about half that of the former holiday village
- The visual impact – from all perspectives – of the planned development will be less than that of the former holiday village
- The plans provide for more than two thirds of the land occupied by the former holiday village and its immediate environs to be handed, gratis, to the people of Jersey
- The plans will provide homes for 28 families
- The plans will ensure the new construction is moved further away from the cliff and coast, reducing the profile and skyline effect.

Although it seems unlikely in the current economic climate, it is possible to envisage the frustrated owner of the former holiday village taking a view that the tide will turn at some time and, against that eventuality, it is possible to devise a business plan to resuscitate the area and use it for its original purpose: it is understood the owner has extensive leisure sector business interests. In the meanwhile, there would be little incentive to expend resources on the site prior to full refurbishment. So, in the short term the eyesore could become worse and long term we could see the site become a vibrant leisure destination again with all the noise, traffic and disruption that attends a holiday village.

The development plans are tasteful and of appropriate mass and density for the site. The buildings in three separate clusters would be constructed in the local vernacular and fit well into the area. They would be immeasurably more attractive than the existing structures. Further, much of the site – importantly the land closest to the cliff and the coast - would be handed over to the people of Jersey, thus addressing the concerns of those who seek to protect coastal areas from new development. In the circumstances it would be infinitely preferable to have a relatively small development of dwellings than a new holiday village. That said, were there no intention ever to return the site to a holiday village, I would still favour the development. The plans appear proportionate to the area and by no means seek to fill the space presently occupied; indeed, one could imagine a significantly greater density of new build still being greatly preferable to the existing structures. In short, the developer's intentions seem reasonable, even modest.

There may be differences of opinion as to the need for 28 new family homes, particularly as economic circumstances have brought about a slow-down in the property market – an unusual phenomenon in this Island. Nevertheless, the population continues to rise and the Housing Minister is on record as stating that there is a serious housing shortage. An additional 28 family homes would be a most welcome addition to Jersey's housing stock. I most certainly do not favour the acquisition of the former holiday village by the States of Jersey using public funds. It is said that returning the whole area to its natural state would provide a valuable amenity for the people to enjoy, but at an exceptionally high cost. However, there has always been public access to the area and it is seldom used, by very few people. This may be because there are a number of similar areas of natural amenity, which are more accessible than Plémont. Also, the plans do return a significant amount of land to the people, gratis.

Much has been made of the fact that an estimated 7,000 individuals joined a "line-in-the-sand" demonstration aimed at preventing further coastal development. Such a demonstration (and the actual numbers are disputed) accounted for less than 7% of the population, so it is reasonable to say 93% are either in favour of further development or indifferent to the issue. It must be pointed out that, though the protesters may wish the holiday village had never been built, it is a fact of life and there is a difference between campaigning against developing new areas and seeking to undo what has been done. If there is a case for returning the area to its natural state, those 7,000 (or however many participated) should form an organisation, negotiate with the landowner and raise the money to purchase it. As an ordinary taxpayer I would object strenuously to my tax pounds being used to acquire land for the gratification of a small minority.

I am entirely satisfied that the plans are reasonable, will provide much needed new family homes and will infinitely improve the Plémont environs. I have no sympathy with those who advocate using taxpayers' funds to acquire a commercial site in order to return it to its former state because it would benefit no one save the few who may from time to time walk there: they have many, many other options.

Finally, I should like to point out I am not involved or connected in any way with any party to this application; my interest is solely that of a concerned Jerseyman.

John Henwood MBE
St John

18 July 2012

15th July 2012

Dear Ms Wilson,

In the States of Jersey 2005 elections I stood for the Island-wide mandate of Senator and, although I was seeking political office for my first time, received 14,025 votes coming second in the Senatorial election. I served as Minister for Health and Social Services, Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and President of the Chairman's Committee. I served as Senator for six years until November 2011, when I decided not to seek re-election.

Whilst I was in the States I had several high profile disagreements with the Planning Minister, Senator Freddie Cohen, concerning his politicising of the planning process and his tendency to disrupt the process through his own subjective views and personal political agenda. The subject of Plemont Holiday Village was discussed privately and it became apparent that he had no desire to determine the application against the wishes of the National Trust and the vocal minority. It seemed to me that delaying tactics were then employed to frustrate the applicants – at the applicants considerable cost. This is a common tactic in Jersey and is used by both politicians and the administration to derail projects or policies they personally deem unfavourable.

I have discussed the application with a number of friends and colleagues and none of them believe that the States should purchase the site and return it to nature. Indeed those that have seen the scheme would all fully support it. The Planning and Building Services Department is an administrative department charged with implementing the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002. They should therefore refrain from political or personal opinions. The inclusion of the following paragraph in Report/P/2006/1868 demonstrates that the Department was succumbing to unacceptable political influence.

“Aside from the consideration and determination of this application under the Planning Law, it is considered that the most appropriate planning solution for this highly sensitive site on the north coast, is for the States to enter into negotiations with the applicant/owner to acquire it and return the land to an open natural state, in the long term best interests of the Island.”

It is considered by who that the States should acquire the site? On what basis is this political statement made, and under what powers? Does the subjective views of the vocal minority now take precedence over the Planning Law? Is it acceptable for a States administration department to make such highly charged comments in what should be a document based on facts and evidence? I would welcome the Public Inquiry's comment on this, and would ask them to question the Officers of the Department on the irrefutable, and presumably substantial, evidence that

they have in their possession that encouraged them to make such a highly political statement. The Public Inquiry should determine whether such statements should be included in Planning Reports going forward.

After the owners submitted their 2006 application for demolishing the existing buildings and converting two thirds of the site to natural open landscape plus a low-key traditional scheme of three housing clusters containing 36 houses (having been drawn up through close consultation with the Planning Department) the States of Jersey debated a proposition (P.112/2006) lodged by the Constable of St Ouen calling on the Assembly to agree it would be in the public interest for the Holiday Village to be “preserved as open space”. I believe that the Constable is a near neighbour of the site and owns significant land nearby. However the incontrovertible fact is that for over 60 years this site has been, and continues to remain, private property that is heavily developed and does not provide any public open space.

During the States Assembly debate held on 10 October 2006 the thrust of my comments were: *“This development, in my opinion, is well thought out. It is generous. It donates quite a bit of land to the Islanders and to the people of Jersey. It does not cost the taxpayer a penny.”*

This remains my position today on the current application, P/2011/1673. The Planning Department recommended approval for the 2006 scheme if it was reduced to 30 houses and the applicant incorporated exactly these recommendations made by the Planning Department into the 2009 application. However, despite the Planning Department’s recommendation to approve this 30 scheme, during 2010 the former Planning Minister subsequently required further revisions which the also owners incorporated into the scheme. This slightly increased the amount of public open natural landscape being created (being donated to the public in perpetuity) leaving the remaining 1/3rd of the site containing just 28 houses with their courtyards and gardens. In fact the developed land excluding gardens (built footprint plus hardstandings) will reduce by 70%, from 20,338 m² existing within the Holiday Village to only 5,965 m² as proposed, covering only 15% of the total site area.

This application is entirely reasonable, complies with the Jersey Planning Law objectives and Island Plan Policies, removes a large blot on the landscape, offers a huge environmental improvement of the site and surrounding area, would result in a much lesser development in keeping with character of the North-West corner of the Island and, as I noted in 2006, the scheme gives a lot of land to the people of Jersey without costing the taxpayers anything. Having made all the changes the Planning Minister required during 2010 the application was placed on the Planning Applications Panel Agenda for them to decide the application on 7 October 2010, but was withdrawn at last minute by the Planning Department. However the Planning Department did publish their report on the 28 house scheme, again recommending approval. This 2009 application remains a ‘live’ pending application still awaiting the Planning Minister’s decision. I have to ask, over twenty months later, why has the Planning Minister or his delegated Planning Panel not already approved this application?

The former Planning Minister Senator Freddie Cohen was also, alongside me, successful in the 2005 elections and we contemporaneously held political office until November 2011. Unlike me Freddie Cohen stood again in the Autumn 2011 elections. His 2011 election manifesto included his revelation *“I left Planning having consistently rejected the plans to develop Plemont and have always promoted its return to nature and acquisition by the public.”*

That is an amazing confession from a Minister responsible for the proper discharge of the planning process, that he intentionally blocked and frustrated the applicants efforts to agree a very reasonable scheme and also stymied his own Departments recommendations to approve a revision of the 2006 application to 30 houses, and also approve the 28 house scheme in the revised 2009 application (as the Minister himself had requested) in October 2010. It is risible of the former Planning Minister to have unreasonably blocked any decision on these applications (while at the same time forcing the Applicants at considerable expense to make lots of changes) because he had a preference for an alternative use of the Applicants private property.

In my view the determination of any Planning application should be based on Planning Law and policies, not on the subjective opinions of either the Planning Minister or minority pressure groups such as the National Trust for Jersey. Furthermore non-planning matters, such as any potential purchase of the site by States or National Trust should not be factors to consider. Both have had ample time to raise adequate funds, submit bids or negotiate a price. The National Trust have had over six years for their public subscription appeal to raise enough funds for acquiring the property, which has dismally failed to acquire anything close to what might be adequate. Their lack of progress on any front, including their failure to persuade States Members to progress with the States acquiring the site, underlines that they do not enjoy support from majority of the general public. It should be noted that the Trust's "Line in the Sand" demonstration was about inappropriate development on the coastline and was not about this scheme for Plemont Bay Holiday Village, which the Planning Department has determined comprises entirely appropriate development for this location which they have confirmed in their reports recommending approval.

One of the primary purposes of the Planning Law is to "improve Jersey's natural beauty, natural resources and general amenities, its character, and its physical and natural environments". The scheme, by returning over two thirds of the site mostly the area closest to the north coast, to open natural landscape and removing the buildings across this area completely achieves these objectives. This site is suitable for housing (with adequate road access and especially the provision of mains drains) which possesses a low-key traditional design entirely in keeping with existing residential properties found in this area of St Ouen.

I therefore ask the Inquiry Inspector to recommend to the Environment Minister that he approves this application without further delay, and also comment on the unacceptable politicisation of the planning process over recent years.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Shenton Chartered FCSI